



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,471	12/10/2001	Ichiro Kajitani	062077	4574	
38834	7590 06/15/2006		EXAMINER		
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			TOPGYAL,	TOPGYAL, GELEK W	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGT	WASHINGTON, DC 20036		2621		

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/016,471	KAJITANI, ICHIRO			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gelek Topgyal	2621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2001.					
	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement				
o) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>12 <i>December</i> 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:					
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
<ul> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
	·				
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  Paper No(s) (Mail Date					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date.  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2621

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (US 7,028,329) in view of Girard et al. (US 5,571,282).

Regarding claim 1, Mizutani teaches a remote accessible programming system Which teaches a confirmation request receiving unit, which receives a request for confirmation of contents of a program this is being broadcast, from a remote user (Figs. 1-7, col. 5, lines 34 - col. 7, line 3, recites wherein a remote user is able to retrieve a list of scheduled broadcast programs from the server 15); a recording request receiving unit which receives a request for recording the program from the user (Fig. 5, Col. 6, lines 39-49, the server 15 receives the request for recording 73 from the user); and a recording instructing unit which instructs a recording of the program recording according to the recording request (the server 15 compares the recording request time with the current time and when the time for recording the desired program is reached, the server 15 controls the recording devices 23-27 to commence recording), but, Mizutani fails to particularly teach that the system includes a capturing unit which captures at least one scene of the program according to the confirmation request and an image transmission processor which transmits a thus captured image to a terminal of the user.

Art Unit: 2621

In an analogous art, Girard et al. teaches a system with a capturing unit which captures at least one scene of the program according to the confirmation request and an image transmission processor which transmits a thus captured image to a terminal of the user (Col. 6, line 8-45, Girard et al. teaches that in the interactive television system, a user can scroll up and down on a program grid that is currently broadcast. The user can then select a certain program, then at least one frame of the video is sent to the specific user's television to be displayed).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the capturing and image transmission unit as taught by Girard et al. into the remote accessible programming as taught by Mizutani to improve visual and hence correct identification of scheduled broadcast programs that have remotely requested to be recorded. This remedies the situation where incorrect EPG titles have been appended to broadcast programs, and hence incorrect programs of choice are recorded due to the lack of visual verification.

3. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (US 7,028,329), in view of Girard et al. (US 5,571,282), and further in view of Trovato et al. (US 6,445,306).

Regarding claim 2, Mizutani teaches a remote accessible programming system Which teaches a confirmation request receiving unit, which receives a request for confirmation of contents of a program this is being broadcast, from a remote user (Figs. 1-7, col. 5, lines 34 - col. 7, line 3, recites wherein a remote user is able to retrieve a list

of scheduled broadcast programs from the server 15); a recording request receiving unit which receives a request for recording the program from the user (Fig. 5, Col. 6, lines 39-49, the server 15 receives the request for recording 73 from the user); and a recording instructing unit which instructs a recording of the program recording according to the recording request (the server 15 compares the recording request time with the current time and when the time for recording the desired program is reached, the server 15 controls the recording devices 23-27 to commence recording), but, Mizutani fails to particularly teach that the system with an electronic program guide (EPG) storage which stores an extended EPG formed by adding to an EPG a guide image indicating contents of a program and an image transmission processor which transmits the thus acquired image to a terminal of the user.

In an analogous art, Girard et al. teaches a system with an image transmission processor which transmits a thus captured image to a terminal of the user (Col. 6, line 8-45, Girard et al. teaches that in the interactive television system, a user can scroll up and down on a program grid that is currently broadcast. The user can then select a certain program, then at least one frame of the video is sent to the specific user's television to be displayed). Girard et al. teaches an EPG storage (Fig. 5-8), but fails to teach that the image sent to the remote user is an image from the extended EPG.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the image transmission unit as taught by Girard et al. into the remote accessible programming as taught by Mizutani to improve visual and hence correct identification of scheduled broadcast programs that have remotely

Art Unit: 2621

requested to be recorded. This remedies the situation where incorrect EPG titles have been appended to broadcast programs, and hence incorrect programs of choice are recorded due to the lack of visual verification.

The proposed combination of Mizutani and Girard et al. teaches all the limitations as disclosed above, but fails to teach that the image sent to the remote user is an image from the extended EPG.

In an analogous art, Trovato et al. teaches a system which has a program guide transferred to the user, wherein the an image within the program guide for each broadcast program is available (col. 9, line 66- col. 11, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the EPG guide image as taught by Trovato into the proposed combination of Mizutani and Girard et al. to improve visual and hence correct identification of scheduled broadcast programs that have remotely requested to be recorded. This remedies the situation where incorrect EPG titles have been appended to broadcast programs, and hence incorrect programs of choice are recorded due to the lack of visual verification.

Regarding claim 3, the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. recites all the limitations as discussed in claim 2 above, and furthermore Girard et al. teaches (Col. 6, line 8-45, Girard et al. teaches that in the interactive television system, a user can scroll up and down on a program grid that is currently broadcast. The user can then select a certain program, then at least one frame of the video is sent to the specific user's television to be displayed).

Art Unit: 2621

Regarding claim 5 and 6, the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. teaches all the limitations as discussed in claim 2 above, Official Notice is taken that CGI and HTML are well known and old in the art to be used as a standard for interfacing external applications (including an apparatus) with information servers on a local area network connected to the world wide web. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use CGI and HTML into the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al. and Trovato et al. to allow a globally accepted format and markup language thereby increasing the user's accessibility of the programmed recording capabilities of the system.

Method claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in system claim 2 above.

Method claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in system claim 3 above.

Method claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in system claim 4 above.

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (US 7,028,329), in view of Girard et al. (US 5,571,282), further in view of Trovato et al. (US 6,445,306), and further in view of Asamura (JP02000341600A).

Claim 4 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above in claim 3, but the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. fails to teach that the EPG guide image is acquired and transmitted to the user.

Art Unit: 2621

In an analogous art, Asamura, teaches that during a commercial message, the system automatically displays the EPG to the user (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically display the EPG to the user as taught by Asamura into the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. so that the user can watch another desired program by being automatically given a choice to tune to another channel during a commercial break.

5. Claim 7, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (US 7,028,329) in view of Girard et al. (US 5,571,282), and further in view of Browne (WO 92/22983).

Claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 1 above, but the proposed combination of Mizutani and Girard et al. fail to particularly teach that a recording unit includes a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner; and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed.

In an analogous art, Browne teaches a large capacity, random access, multisource recorder that teaches a recording unit including a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner (Pg. 19, line 6-18, and pg. 7, line 20- pg 8, line 23 teaches a FIFO recorder that continuously records a program, even records over material that have been previously recorded in the case that storage capacity has run out); and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed (Pg. 8, line 6-23 discloses wherein a program is recorded retroactively from the beginning of the broadcast time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the free-run and program storage recording capabilities as taught by Browne into the proposed combination of Mizutani, and Girard et al., so that in the case of a live sports broadcast where a game goes into overtime or extra innings, the free-run recording option allows the user to not miss any desired portion not foreseen in a prescheduled EPG. In the case of the program storage option, it allows users to not miss an entire show even though the user programs the system a certain amount of time after the beginning of the broadcast program.

Regarding claim 13, Mizutani, Girard et al., and Browne disclose the limitations as discussed in claims 1 and 7, above, except a capturing is located in the recording unit. In the rejection of this claim, the examiner intends to include the capturing unit in the recording unit.

**Regarding claim 14**, the systems of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Browne as discussed above in claims 1, 7 and 13 can be incorporated into a single system.

6. Claims 8, 9, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mizutani (US 7,028,329), in view of Girard et al. (US 5,571,282), in view of Trovato et al. (US 6,445,306), and further in view of Browne (WO 92/22983).

Art Unit: 2621

Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 2 above, but the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. fails to particularly teach that a recording unit includes a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner; and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed.

In an analogous art, Browne teaches a large capacity, random access, multi-source recorder that teaches a recording unit including a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner (Pg. 19, line 6-18, and pg. 7, line 20- pg 8, line 23 teaches a FIFO recorder that continuously records a program, even records over material that have been previously recorded in the case that storage capacity has run out); and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed (Pg. 8, line 6-23 discloses wherein a program is recorded retroactively from the beginning of the broadcast time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the free-run and program storage recording capabilities as taught by Browne into the proposed combination of Mizutani, and Girard et al., so that in the case of a live sports broadcast where a game goes into overtime or extra innings, the free-run recording option allows the user to not miss any desired portion not foreseen in a prescheduled EPG. In the case of the program storage option,

Application/Control Number: 10/016,471

Art Unit: 2621

it allows users to not miss an entire show even though the user programs the system a certain amount of time after the beginning of the broadcast program.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed in claim 3 above, but the proposed combination of Mizutani, Girard et al., and Trovato et al. fails to particularly teach that a recording unit includes a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner; and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed.

In an analogous art, Browne teaches a large capacity, random access, multi-source recorder that teaches a recording unit including a free-run recording unit which records a program being broadcast continuously in an endless manner (Pg. 19, line 6-18, and pg. 7, line 20- pg 8, line 23 teaches a FIFO recorder that continuously records a program, even records over material that have been previously recorded in the case that storage capacity has run out); and a program storage which stores a program, from a start point of the program retroactively, whose recording has been instructed (Pg. 8, line 6-23 discloses wherein a program is recorded retroactively from the beginning of the broadcast time).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the free-run and program storage recording capabilities as taught by Browne into the proposed combination of Mizutani, and Girard et al., so that in the case of a live sports broadcast where a game goes into overtime or

extra innings, the free-run recording option allows the user to not miss any desired portion not foreseen in a prescheduled EPG. In the case of the program storage option, it allows users to not miss an entire show even though the user programs the system a certain amount of time after the beginning of the broadcast program.

Regarding claim 15, Mizutani, Girard et al., Trovato et al. and Browne disclose the limitations as discussed in claims 2 and 8, above, except a capturing is located in the recording unit. In the rejection of this claim, the examiner intends to include the capturing unit in the recording unit.

Regarding claim 16, the systems of Mizutani, Girard et al., Trovato et al. and Browne as discussed above in claims 2, 8 and 15 can be incorporated into a single system.

## Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited references refer to video recording apparatus with the ability to record broadcast programs by way of a remote.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gelek Topgyal whose telephone number is 571-272-8891. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am -5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gelek Topgyal 5/30/2006

PRIMATY EVALUEER